
Formation of a Commentary in Nineteenth Century Japan

Motoori Scholar Nakayama Umashi's Approach to
Gosen Wakashū

Saori TAMADA

Introduction

The act of reading classics is the act of overcoming an enormous cultural gap. Its methodology may vary according to the interest, but in order to reach an interpretation acceptable to others as well, it must meet the characteristics of the text. From such standpoint, the aim of this paper is to analyze the approach taken by Nakayama Umashi (中山美石 1775–1843), to present the example of an attempt from nineteenth century Japan. Through his struggle in interpreting imperial poetry of mid-nine hundreds, *Gosen Wakashū* 後撰和歌集 (hereafter *Gosenshū* 後撰集), he produced a printed commentary called *Gosen Wakashū Shinshō* 後撰和歌集新抄 (hereafter *Shinshō* 新抄). Since his work is praised for its achievement¹, it is highly likely that his approach matched the characteristics of *Gosenshū*. While discussing his approach, this paper will also show a feature of the text.

The Motoori School tradition, which Umashi owes a part of his results, is an integral piece of the history and the current state of Japanese scholarship. Following in the long tradition of classical study, Motoori Norinaga (本居宣長 1730–1801) made many noteworthy accomplishments, attracting scholars all over the country. His school thrived to see the Meiji Restoration and its accomplishments have been handed down to modern scholars. In addition to the goals above, this paper, focusing on Norinaga's successors, will clarify the scholarly process directly after Norinaga's death. This study not only discusses the formation of Umashi's commentary, but aspires to illustrate a characteristic of the text and to illuminate the tradition of inquiry which leads to ours today.

1 For example, "A notch above the other *Gosen Wakashū* commentaries." (Hirano Yukiko 平野由紀子. "*Gosenshū Shinshō*" 後撰集新抄. In *Nihon Koten Bungaku Daijiten* 日本古典文学大辞典, ed. Nihon Koten Bungaku Daijiten Henshū Inkai, p. 620. Iwanami Shoten, 1983). "As a whole, no commentary has exceeded *Shinshō* yet." (Kudō Shigenori 工藤重矩. *Kaidai* 解題 (*Gosen Wakashū* 後撰和歌集). In *Izumi Koten Sōsho* 和泉古典叢書 3, p. 16. Izumi Shoin, 1992).

1. Texts and Academic Basis

Before discussing Umashi's approach, I would like to present the basic context concerning *Shinshō* and the author.

Shinshō is a text blessed with extant manuscripts and texts that portray the development of the text, especially in that the manuscripts both before and after publication remains. It is possible to chronicle the process of Umashi's research by following the extant texts. Since Umashi's praised accomplishments do contain notable findings, as I will discuss later on, following the formation process of *Shinshō* also provides a good model for interpreting the *Gosenshū*.

There are four main texts that show the formation process of *Shinshō*². First is a print *Gosenshū* book, chapters 1–20, which Umashi used to write in his considerations, to be corrected by his teacher. Second is the draft of the layout papers for *Shinshō*, chapters 9, 10 and 13. Third is *Shinshō*, a print book containing chapters 1–16 and a supplemental chapter 別記. And the last is *Yobukodori Kō* 呼子鳥考, focusing on the mysterious bird “*Yobukodori*” which appears in several *waka* of the text. Although the publication of *Shinshō* proceeded slowly, with only several chapters at a time, and was derailed during the author's life, it achieved modern publication, without the supplemental chapter, yet while retaining chapters 19 and 20.

Most astounding is the first, the printed *Gosenshū*, which has Umashi's writing all over the margins, in between lines, and with additional memo sheets attached to the bottom of the page. When those memo sheets are folded up into the book, the book is up to more than three times the thickness of the original³. Its very thickness evokes the energy directed to this growing text, which took at least twenty years in production during Umashi's lifetime, yet was still left unfinished.

Nakayama Umashi was born to a family of infantryman in the Mikawa Yoshida domain 三河吉田藩, present-day Toyohashi City of Aichi Prefecture 愛知県豊橋市. In 1813, he was elevated to the samurai class and later on commissioned as a professor at the *han* school Jishūkan, the samurai school of the domain 藩校時習館教授. In 1805 he entered the school of Motoori Ōhira (本居大平 1756–1833), Norinaga's step-son successor and the head of the major National Studies 国学 School. Umashi had also learned Chinese Studies 漢学 in his youth, and became interested in Shingaku 心学, popular moral philosophy at that time. His records and works indicate he was deeply trusted by his lords.

He was also deeply trusted by his teacher. According to the will, Ōhira's youngest

2 The owners are as follows: 1) University of California, Berkeley (5895.4/5281), 2) same (3–4–433), 3) Murakami Bunko Library of Kariya Central Library 刈谷市中央図書館村上文庫 (1338) and many others, 4) Keiō Gijyuku University Library 慶應義塾大学図書館 (146/100/1) and Tokyō Daigaku Kokubungaku Laboratory 東京大学国文学研究室 (Kokubun/ 435/1672).

3 In addition to Umashi and Ohira's handwriting, there is also another, probably of Motoori Toyokai (本居豊穎 1834–1913), Ohira's grandson. From the ownership mark of successive Motoori family head, the book eventually became stored in the Motoori Bunko Library 本居文庫. The original thickness should have been 2.1cm (0.83 in) for vol.1 and 2.6cm (1.02 in) for 2, but this book measures 3.2cm (1.26 in) and 7.7cm (3.03 in) respectively.

son Nagahira (永平 1819–1842) was trained under Umashi’s tutelage for a while. There were many scholars, especially from the Motoori school who Umashi associated with, but Natsume Mikamaro (夏目甕磨 1773–1822) and Jissōin Kodō (実相院古道?–1852) were the main assistants to his research of the *Gosenshū*.

In what way, then, did Umashi’s struggle yield results? In the next sections, I will take a closer look at examples of his methods, philological and folklore, and conclude by highlighting the idea which enabled his belief in the use of folklore approach, his distinctive attitude.

2. Philological Approach

According to explanatory note 凡例, previous commentaries he consulted while formulating his interpretation, were limited to the following: *Gosenshū Seigi* 後撰集正義, presumably written by Fujiwara no Tameie (藤原為家 1198–1275), notes of Keichū (契沖 1625–1705), and *Hachidaishū Shō* 八代集抄 by Kitamura Kigin (北村季吟 1640–1701). All were comparatively simplistic, surely requiring considerable effort to reach a more satisfactory interpretation⁴. His first method would be called philological⁵, which uses written evidence to recover the original text and its meaning. First, I will clarify how he performed his textual criticism, the most important of philological approach.

The *Gosenshū* text which *Shinshō* used is known as *Shōhō Hanpon* 正保版本. This printed book was published in 1647, and became the most circulated version of pre-modern era. It belongs to the Teika lineage of distribution 定家本系統. On it, Umashi writes in the variant readings of recognized Supposed-Kōzei version 伝行成筆本, which he copied from *Hachidaishū Shō*. His attitude is discreet, as can be summarized: “To assume the unintelligible as erratum is generally a bad idea. When you search more broadly, unexpected outcomes often appear. Regarding something as mistake

4 There is another *Gosenshū* commentary which was published around the same time: *Gosen Wakashū Hyōchū* 後撰和歌集標注. Its publication is sometime after July of 1816, according to the latest date on the prefaces. (Senoo Yoshinobu 妹尾好信. *Kaidai* 解題. (*Kishimoto Yuzuru Gosen Wakashū Hyōchū* 岸本由豆流 後撰和歌集標注). In *Kenkyū Sōsho* 研究叢書 78, p. 335. Izumi Shoin, 1989.) After the bookstore guild was set up in mid pre-modern period, all publication of *mon no hon* 物の本 had to go under inspection of *Gyōji* 行事/行司 chosen within the guild. Application was submitted with the layout paper to be checked for any illegal element, then turned into magistrate’s office for a formal verification. See Horikawa Takashi 堀川貴司. *Shosigaku Nyūmon: Kotenseki o miru/shiru/yomu* 書誌学入門—古典籍を見る・知る・読む—, p. 164. Bensei Shuppan, 2010. The spring section, or the first three chapters of *Shinshō*, was permitted in April, but the succeeding chapters were waiting for next submission in 1821. From the sameness of expression *Shinshō* used in citing someone’s 或人idea of *waka* 689, chapter 10, Love 2, Umashi could have used *Hyōchū* in his latter chapters. Exact year of publication for *Hyōchū* is unknown, but from its comparative simpleness, it seems unlikely to have lagged like *Shinshō*.

5 The proper translated term in Japanese is “Bunkengaku 文献学,” but modern *Bunkengaku* experienced a unique development, eliminating operations which require subjectivity. It may well be said as closer to bibliography 書誌学 (Konishi Jin’ichi 小西甚一. “Nihonbungaku no rireki” 日本文学の履歴. *Nihon Bungeishi Bessatsu* 日本文藝史 別冊. Kasama Shoin, 2009. See also Matsuno Yōichi 松野陽一. “Bunkengaku” 文献学. In *Nihon Kotenseki Shoshigaku Jiten* 日本古典籍書誌学辞典, ed. Inoue Muneco 井上宗雄 et al., p. 510. Iwanami Shoten, 1999).

readers to deduce their own conclusions, we can see that he was committed to accuracy.

Of course, the result of the commentary cannot solely be ascribed to Umashi's effort. As I stated in the first section, while working with *Gosenshū* print book, he continually received advice from his fellow scholars, with his teacher checking his work in the end. His teacher, Ōhira, played especially important role of all, in that he also provided documented evidence. As the second step in analyzing Umashi's philological approach, I will now explain how Umashi utilized the Motoori resources. It should also reveal a part of the academic activity of Ōhira's school. Comments as such are found:

こしのかたに、思ふ人侍ける時に

貫之

秋の夜にかりも鳴てぞわたるなる、異かりかもなきてわたるなり我思ふ人のことつてやせし

When I was longing for someone in Koshi Prefecture

Tsurayuki

<i>Aki no yon i</i>	Is it geese,
<i>karikamo nakite</i>	crying into the autumn night,
<i>watarunari</i>	flying close by?
<i>waga omou hito no</i>	Is it because my loved one
<i>kotozute ya seshi</i>	made them carry a letter?

*[...] Also, *karikamo* かりかも must be the miscopy of *karigane* かりがね, said Katō Isotari 加藤磯足 [Isotari is from Okoshi of Owari Prefecture 尾張国起, a disciple of Master Suzunoya 鈴屋大人]. (Autumn 3, 356)

In *waka* 356, Tsurayuki created his *waka* based on the literary tradition of goose letter 雁信, which a goose is depicted as carrying a letter from distance away. The underlined section in the annotation comes from Ōhira's comment written in the *Gosenshū* print text, "Isotari says: *Karikamo* must be the miscopy of *karigane*." Ōhira probably took it from *Katō Isotari Gosenshū Gimon* 加藤磯足後撰集疑問¹⁰ in which Katō Isotari (1747–1809) states "If you take *karikamo* as a stanza, there is no reason for closing it with *wataru nari* わたるなり. Maybe it is a mistake of *karigane nakite* かりがね鳴きて." The book is a copy of questions sent to Norinaga by Isotari, asking for an opinion. Here, Isotari is probably trying to figure out the unbalance of using *kamo*, a particle containing questioning nuance and *nari*, an auxiliary he had mistaken to be assertion 断定 instead of presumption 推定. In Norinaga's comment, he approves, saying "Just like your argument, there is no reason when you take *karikamo* as a stanza, but considering it as a mistake of *karigane*, makes it understandable."

Though Umashi writes in the opinion of Norinaga's disciple, he seems reluctant to accept it, and follows that of Kobayashi Shigeoka (小林茂岳 1794–1876) in the end. Evidence from related texts as such well illustrate the fact that Ōhira actively

10 Citation is from vol. Bekkan 2 of *Motoori Norinaga Zenshū* 本居宣長全集 (Chikuma Shobō, 1991).

introduced Norinaga's interpretation. In addition, in the *Gosenshū* print book, concerning the abstruse vocabulary of *sakusame no toji* さくさめのとじ and *atougatari* あとうかたり in *waka* 1259, chapter Miscellaneous 雑 4, Umashi asks "Do you have any concrete idea, or did the late master have any ideas?" Umashi himself was depending on heritage from Norinaga.

At other times, Ōhira makes contributions by presenting evidence found in his research of *Saibara* 催馬楽, ancient court music, while on the other hand adopting Umashi's arguments, adding them to his own notes of *Gosenshū* interpretation¹¹. There are also times when Umashi quotes Ōhira's pupil's work only for once. It is probable that Ōhira was the source for these works. During his life, Ōhira stored the documents of his own studies and documents received from his disciples, then distributed them back when necessary¹². The site of the formation of *Shinshō* was in the midst of such intellectual circle, where Umashi was conducting his research supplied with abundant documents and academic knowledge.

3. Folklore Approach

When discussing Nakayama Umashi's research, there is another academic approach that we must not forget. It is the folkloristic method¹³, the method which uses evidence such as dialect and provincial custom, something marginal and non-documented, to be specific.

Since no one can escape the cultural context of the day, it is essential to refer to coeval materials, but there is a dearth of extant materials, especially in the study of ancient times. To counteract this problem, the folklore method was utilized from time to time, even before Umashi¹⁴. As for Umashi, his usage was continuous; he also used folklore approach in his research of the *Nihon Shoki* 日本書紀¹⁵. Positive assessment of folklore materials in Japanese Classics appeared in the pre-modern era starting with Kamo no Mabuchi (賀茂真淵 1697–1769). It was then followed by Norinaga's

11 Information Ōhira presented is used in the comment of supplemental chapter discussing *waka* 1103 of Miscellaneous 1. In turn, Umashi's explanation is written down in *waka* 572 of *Gosenshū Mitsusuke ōhira Mondō* 後撰集光輔大平問答 (Owned by Tokyo Daigaku Kokubungaku Laboratory, Kokubun Ao 国文 青/50/622).

12 Norinaga's work also cites findings of his pupil. Active accumulation and returning of the knowledge was probably their common style.

13 Similar to philology, the content of Japanese folklore is different from its western half, maintaining closeness to Ethnology and having strong interest toward rural structure and life. (Mano Toshikazu 真野俊和. "Dai 3 Kō Minzokugaku no dezain" 第3講 民俗学のデザイン. Orig. pub. 2007; repr. in *Nihon Minzokugaku Genron: Jinbungaku no tame no ressun* 日本民俗学原論—人文学のためのレッスン—, pp. 49–54. Yoshikawa Kōbunkan, 2009).

14 For example, they are used in *Toshiyori Zuinō* 俊頼髓腦; in *waka* diction "tamahabaki 玉箒" and "kekerenaku けけれなく," in *Hekian Shō* 僻案抄; in *waka* 208 of *Kokinshū* 古今集, and 1082 of *Gosenshū*.

15 *Nihon Shoki* (148/123) owned by Iwase Bunko Library of Nishio City 西尾市岩瀬文庫. It is also written in on print text. No completed commentary remains. The order of operation between the two is uncertain. Since the usage of folklore material vary according to the era and content of the piece, especially about its balance with philological method, this paper will set aside Umashi's approach in *Nihon Shoki*.

proclamation, and then succeeded in his school¹⁶, as I will discuss below. Umashi's interest probably rose in such environment.

How exactly then, did Umashi apply the materials in his commentary? And how was it balanced with his philological method? To answer such questions, I will first look at an example which carry a comment based on the dialect:

人々もろともに、はまづらをまかる道に、山の紅葉を、
 これかれよみ侍けるに 忠岑
 いくきともえこそ見わかしらね、忠岑集の異本ねあぎやまのもみぢの錦よそにたてれば

When I was traveling along the seashore with others,
 some made a *waka* of colored leaves in the mountains

Tadamine

<i>Ikuki tomo</i>	How many, how long,	
<i>ekoso miwakane</i>	I cannot figure out—	
<i>akiyama no</i>	the brocade of colored trees	
<i>momiji no nishiki</i>	spread afar,	
<i>yoso ni tatereba</i>	in the autumn mountains.	(Autumn 3, 387)

In the beginning of struggle using *Gosenshū* print book, Umashi asks Ōhira, “Does the word *ikuki* いく木 form word association?” The word *ki* is scribed with a character meaning tree, but this comes from the actual calligraphy of the print text. Umashi is not asking about word association in the tree context. At this point Umashi realized viscerally that this word contains some crucial meaning in the brocade context, but could not find any documental evidence. In Ōhira's response, a line is crossed over the comment “not yet solved,” with a hint written next to it. It reads “Someone says, in the Yamashiro 山城 and Yamato 大和 slang, the length of clothes is counted one *ki* 着, two *ki* 着. If you look closely at old *waka*, there could be ones using *ki* 木 in association. Please consider.” “This ‘someone’ is Suga no Naoiri 須賀直入.” This explanation proposed by Suga Naoiri (1752–1812), a Norinaga disciple and step-son to Ōhira, argue based on contemporary dialect. This is appropriate since there is an example from *Nihon Shoki*: “The length of silk to be ... *futasaka amari itsuki* 二尺アマリイツキ半” (Kōtoku history, second year of Taika 孝徳紀大化二年)¹⁷. Umashi seemed to have followed this advice, for he lists one *waka* in *Shinshō*. No remaining commentary before or at the time has come to the same interpretation. This is a good example of

16 For the influence of Mabuchi on Norinaga concerning this approach, see Hino Tatsuo 日野龍夫. (“Miyako kara hina e: Kamo no Mabuchi no hōhō kanken” 都から鄙へ—賀茂真淵の方法管見一. Orig. pub. 1987; repr. in vol. 2 of *Hino Tatsuo Chosaku Shū* 日野龍夫著作集, Perikan Sha, 2005). According to Hino, this approach goes back to Ogyū Sorai (荻生徂徠 1666–1728). In *Narubeshi* 南留別志 chapter 1, Sorai states that many ancient words remain in the countryside. Norinaga also is known for direct influence from Sorai.

17 Citation is from Kitano version 北野本, which is the oldest remaining text with readings added on Chapter 25. The reading is said to be written in around 1350s. (Miyachi Naokazu 宮地直一. *Kitanobon Nihon Shoki kaisetsu* 北野本日本書紀解説 (*Nihon Shoki: Kokuhō Kitanobon* 日本書紀: 国宝北野本), p. 12. Kichō Tosho Fukuseikai, 1941).

how Umashi benefited from his school at the same time suggesting the folklore approach functioning as an aid to that of philological.

Secondly, there are examples as follows, which well illustrates the relationship between philological and folklore approach:

男の、物などいひ遣しける女の、みなかのいへにまかりて、
 たゝぎけれとも△^えき△^抄つげずやありけん、かどもあけずなりにければ、
 田のほとりにかへるのなきけるをききて (よみ人しらず)
 足引のやまだのそほづうちわびてひとりかへるの音をぞなきぬる こそなかるれ、又の一本

A man went over to a country home of the women whom he was making an approach. He knocked on the gate but perhaps not hearing, she did not open it. On hearing the croaking of *kaeru* かへる, frogs (Anonymous)

*Ashihiki no
 yamada no sōzu
 uchiwabite
 hitori kaeru no
 ne o zo nakinuru*

I, like the worn out, foot aching scarecrow in the mountain rice paddy went home forlorn and alone, crying like the frogs in the paddy, wearied from knocking in vain.

(Love 4, 806)

Umashi questions the expression underlined. *Sōzu* normally means the scarecrow, but *Hachidaishū Shō*, the predecessor, explains “*Sōzu* そほづ is something meant to scare deers, which is set at a waterside. The water runs through the device and makes a noise.” This interpretation derives from the phrase *uchiwabite* 打ちわびて directly under *sōzu*, which means tired of knocking. Umashi criticizes this interpretation as follows:

The item to be beaten by water mentioned in *Shō* is a type of *hita* 引板, a noise-maker, which is different. However, the phrase *uchiwabite* in this *waka* surely means to describe the man frazzled by knocking. Therefore, since the scarecrows are sometimes made to knock on *hita*, this *waka* could have been composed to associate with such. It could still be what he actually saw at the scene.

Here, Umashi suggests a compromise in his explanation based on a piece of folklore fact that a scarecrow was hitting on the noise-maker, but he was not satisfied with this explanation. In *Shinshō*, he adds another piece of folklore, this time contributing to the other side of the argument: “In the mountain sides of Kamo 賀茂 village of my Yoshida province, people still call those tools that are beaten by water ‘*sōzu*.’ It could have been called so since the ancient times.” However, Umashi did not feel that this argument was strong enough to counter his previous beliefs recorded in the *Gosenshū* print text. He felt folklore evidence alone insufficient for a theory.

The folklore method in the two examples discussed above was applied as an alternative, when no written evidence was available. There is a case where folklore

evidence counter with that of a marginalia, resulting in adopting the document¹⁸. On the other hand, no existing text proves that the folklore evidence is given a priority. In Umashi's opinion, a piece of folklore does not carry the same weight as a piece of written evidence.

What then, was the idea which supported such conceptualization? As I have stated, Norinaga declared the value of folklore material. However, in spite of the huge amount of documents he left behind, no actual text in which Norinaga revealed his beliefs and approach exists. Norinaga's outcome was sporadic also, and not much was accomplished by his pupil either¹⁹. Therefore, there is little information outside Umashi's own text. The discussion below will focus on this characteristic method to clarify the belief that lies beneath and the academic condition which supposedly provided foundation of the method.

First is the condition which acted as the seedbed. Norinaga's declaration in *Tamakatsuma* 玉勝間²⁰ which marked the beginning was such as below:

In general, ancient words often remain in the countryside. Interesting ones are found especially in the words of people from distant provinces. For the last several years, whenever people visited from distant places, I always remembered to ask about the words of their province, to listen carefully to the words they speak. How so interesting would it be, if I could gather widely the words of the countryside, all over the country.

(Chapter 7, article 415, "About the ancient noble words remaining in the countryside ゐなかにいにしへの^{ミヤヒゴト}の雅言ののこれる事。")

Not just the words, but various old-fashioned noble customs remain often in the remote countryside. [...] I wish to ask and collect widely all such things, of different provinces, from seaside villages to ones deep in the mountains, and record them on documents.

(Chapter 8, article 419, "About the ancient customs remaining in the countryside ゐなかに古へのわざののこれる事。")

The former focuses on dialect and the latter on custom. As is seen in the first line of article 419, he points out that words and customs from antiquity remain in local regions. Because Norinaga aspired to grasp the meaning of words from the time before they were influenced by *karagokoro* 漢意, or Chinese sensibility, both provincial words and customs were highly appreciated as its heritage. Also, as in the last line of article 415, interest for exhaustive accumulation of folklore materials is shown.

Norinaga's wish to gather folklore was realized by his school, though it is not

18 Miscellaneous 1, *waka* 1085. Here, Umashi mentions a piece of folklore from Mikawa Yoshida which is at variance with *Wamyō Ruijyū Shō* 和名類聚抄, but in *Shinshō*, *Wamyō Shō* is introduced as sufficient, Mikawa Yoshida material not even mentioned.

19 Yoshida 吉田悦之 discusses examples seen in *Man'yo Shū* 万葉集 research of Tanaka Michimaro (田中道麿 1724–1784) as an example of exercise in Norinaga's disciple. ("Furuki koto no useyuku: Minzoku no hensen to Motoori Norinaga" ふるき事のうせゆく—民俗の変遷と本居宣長—. *Mie Kenshi Kenkyū* 三重県史研究 21 (2006), pp. 10–11).

20 Citation is from vol. 1 of *Motoori Norinaga Zeshū* (Chikuma Shōbo, 1968).

evident when. On October 25 of an unknown year, a letter was sent out by Ōhira saying “What I would like to ask the people traveling out to provinces from the Yamada front 山田表, including castle towns and mountain area 山中向, is that I wish them to give me notes on the customs of those places, in its dialects, from January to December, concerning annual events, Shintō and Buddhist services, exchanges with relatives, customs in hiring apprentices 奉公人召抱, celebration 祝儀, grieving 凶儀 and children’s games 子供遊び as well²¹.”

Besides this, a nationwide custom survey was conducted in the middle of Bunka period (1804–1818), led by Yashiro Kōken (屋代弘賢 1758–1841), a clerical officer 右筆 of Tokugawa Shogunate. What is interesting is the names of the people who distributed the survey, “Provincial Custom Questionnaire 諸国風俗問状²².” Some of the questionnaires have the name Ishihara Masaaki (石原正明 1760–1821) instead of Kōken. Masaaki not only belonged to the school of Hanawa Hokiichi (塙保己一 1746–1821) with Kōken, he used to be Norinaga’s pupil. His name appears in *Shinshō* also, indicating he maintained contact with the Motoori scholars²³. In addition, the distributors of the eight out of twenty four remaining reports are Ōhira’s pupils. This may simply be the result of multitude of Motoori disciples; there were more than a thousand in fifty-three domains²⁴. Just like Umashi responsible for Mikawa Yoshida, it included famous nationalists 国学者 of the area to some degree. Along with the Ōhira letter, however, it probably shows the high degree of interest that school held toward them²⁵. Umashi’s inclination toward folklore method was probably fostered in such atmosphere.

21 *Meika Shukan: Kokugaku* 名家手簡 国学, owned by Kokugakuin Daigaku Library 國學院大學図書館 (Ki 貴/1413).

22 Specific dates concerning the survey is unclear, but the earliest completion known is *Mutsu no Kuni Shinobu Gun Date Tōsho* 陸奥国信夫郡伊達答書 in February of 1814. This survey was later admitted by Yanagita Kunio 柳田国男 as his predecessor in folklore survey. (“Shokoku Fūzoku Toijyō to sono tōsho” 諸国風俗問状とその答書. Orig, pub. 1916; repr. In vol. 25 of *Yanagita Kunio Zenshū* 柳田国男全集, p. 152. Chikuma Shobō, 2000).

23 The Commentary on *waka* 512 is a good example of Umashi’s direct contact with Masaaki.

24 *Fuji no Kakitsu Ō Ryaku Nenpu Furoku Oshiego Meibo* 藤垣内翁略年譜附録教子名簿 owned by Toyohashi City Library 豊橋市図書館 (121.1/97) and others.

25 According to Minami Keiji 南啓治, relationship of surveys between Ōhira and Kōken/ Masaaki is “not yet clear with so little information.” (“Kokugakusha to minzoku 1” 国学者と民俗 I. Orig, pub. 1989; repr. in *Kinsē Kokugaku to Sono Shūhen* 近世国学とその周辺. Miyai Shoten, 1992). Of documents counted as answers for Kōken’s survey, six are Ōhira-owned books stored in Tokyo University Kokubungaku Laboratory. Separation of the two surveys must come first. It is evident from Umashi’s record that there was a survey carried out beyond Motoori network. In his official record *Kujiki* 公事記, on November 11 of 1816, Umashi writes that he was assigned by his lord to answer Kōken. Umashi, of course, is a Motoori scholar but this apparently came by a different route. Also, in Awaji Province 淡路国, a systematic collection was performed using Kunigashira Shōya 国頭庄屋 system. (Ogurisu Kenji 小栗栖健治. “Shokoku Fūzoku Toijyō Awaji no Kuni Tsuna Gun Kume Gumi Tōsho nitsuite” 諸国風俗問状淡路国津名郡来馬組答書について. In *Homyō Shōnin Roppayaku Gojū Onki Kinen Ronbun Shū* 法明上人六百五十遠忌記念論文集, ed. Yūzūnenbutsu Shūkyogaku Kenkyūsho 融通念仏宗教学研究社, pp. 444–45. Dai Nenbutsuji 大念佛寺, 1998). For now, I only recognize Ōhira’s survey, seen in his letter, as reflection of interest in Motoori School.

4. Faith in Folklore Approach

What kind of potential did the folklore method carry for Nakayama Umashi? In this last section, I will focus on *Yobukodori Kō* which I introduced in section 1, to cover Umashi's interest in depth. My last objection is to clarify the basis of his faith in the approach. This text pursues the identity of a bird known by the name *Yobukodori*, depicted in four *waka* in *Gosenshū* (79, 690, 1034, 1035). It has two pretexts, the print *Gosenshū* book and *Shinshō*, enabling a follow-up of the pursuit in three different stages.

The identity of the bird *Yobukodori* has long been a mystery. In *Kokin Denjyu* 古今伝授, an esoteric *waka* learning system, it was counted as one of the three secret birds. In Umashi's day, it was no longer a secret bird, but the identity still remained unknown.

It was not easy for Umashi to face the challenge of searching the identity of this bird. In the first stage, the *Gosenshū* print text, Umashi doubts Mabuchi's interpretation: "Explanation in *Uchigiki* 打聴 is also a bit unacceptable. What do you think?" Unfortunately, Ōhira's reply is not recorded. Then in the second stage, in *Shinshō*, he presents an explanation of Irie Masaki (入江昌喜 1722–1800). In his book *Kubo no Susabi* 久保のすさび, Masaki confirms Keichū's interpretation by adding new material, a *waka* from an alternative version of the anthology of early-Heian poet, Ōshikōchi no Mitsune (凡河内躬恒 alive 914). Umashi concludes, "It does seem to indicate the pigeon which cries *toshiyori ko* としよりこ." The case seems to be closed, but in the in-line notes just below, additional statement is made quoting Norinaga.

In the first place, "it is the nature of a scholar's mind to give first priority to clarifying the daunting problems. When we examine facile questions to see if they are all solved, however, even the elementary ones are still left in dispute. It is shameful to try to uncover the difficult ones while skipping them under such condition. There are often unexpected misunderstandings in trivial matters appearing intelligible. Therefore, one should approach only after thoroughly going over, unveiling and fully understanding the simple ones." says Master Suzunoya. However, it would be frustrating to avoid challenging at all, but how significant is it to unravel just one or two intricate problems? I am mentioning it just for the record because it is crucial for beginners to understand.

This statement warns becoming obsessed with pursuing challenging questions. What is arresting is the line of logic. Though Umashi sides with Norinaga in the end, his thoughts twist and turn, saying "however, it would be frustrating to avoid challenging at all, but how significant is it to unravel just one or two intricate problems?," expressing sincere regret for passing by profound questions without attempting to answer them. It should not be a leap of logic to read Umashi's intention to defend the failure and justify his retreat using Norinaga's words. Just like other in-line notes containing relevant topics, there must be some motive behind, which drove him to

break bounds in commenting. The amount of time and energy devoted to this question between the first and the second stage is unknown, but the in-line note bear the stamp of his chagrin. Posing to persuade the beginners, it seems to try to reason himself out of this quest.

Umashi's speculation must have ended by November of 1815, before submitting application of the spring sections²⁶. *Yobukodori Kō*²⁷, however, reveals that the pursuit was relaunched promptly afterward. In the discussion below, I will now search for clues to uncover Umashi's foothold in exercising folklore approach.

According to *Yobukodori Kō*, the question which arose after the submission of the layout paper was that “the pigeon which cries *toshiyori ko* としよりこ is called *juuzukake* pigeon 数珠掛鳩 in slang, which is a bird different from mountain pigeons 山鳩.” It is a statement proposed based on his reliance toward folklore material. Eventually, this interpretation is dismissed since ancient *waka* does not describe its profile. Next, Mabuchi's claim of “*kappō* bird かつぼう鳥” mentioned in *Shinshō* is reexamined, only to be denied as well, for it conflicts with the description drawn from classical *waka* composed between the Heian and Kamakura periods. Here, Umashi is captured as still clinging to a piece of folklore, yet at the same time coming to a deadlock due to lack of sufficient written evidence. Then he experiences a breakthrough:

And when I, Umashi, moved and lived in Arai 新居 of Tōtōmi Province 遠江国 [where the bridge of Hamana 浜名橋 was] a while ago, there was a mountain in front of my house, called Mount Genta 源太山, not deep but moderate. I heard an unfamiliar cry from the mountain. At first I was simply wondering what it was. When I asked the people in the area, I was told “It is a mountain pigeon.” Its cry lingered, sounding “*fūfufu u fūfufu u u fufu u.*” The call came high and low, a bit deep and soft, just like playing Japanese flute beautifully, only not as soft and clear. It was more like blowing on bamboo tube, so to speak. Unexpectedly I uttered the phrase “*obotsukanaku* おぼつかなく, wondering what it was,” which made me attracted all the more. I always listened and watched for it, and it seemed to cry mainly from February to May, but also in fall and winter, regardless of time.

I went to its side whenever I heard the cry, hoping to see its appearance somehow. It turned out that it was a bird a bit smaller than an ordinary pigeon, its color yellowish green with glossy luster. It was similar to the small bird commonly known as *mejiro* 目白, a white eye, only shinier. The beak and the foot seemed rose pink, but since I only saw them in trees, I could not catch other details. This is what it says in *Honzō* 本草 as “*Qīng jiāo* 青鷓 [Chinese reading: *Chuí* 錘], *Shì míng* 積名: *huáng hè hóu* 黃褐候, *Jí jiě* 集解: [*Cáng qì* 藏器 says, the shape of *huáng hè hóu* is like a pigeon in green

26 Ōsaka Toshō Shuppangyō Kumiai 大阪図書出版業組合. *Kyōhō Igo Ōsaka Shuppan Shoseki Mokuroku* 享保以後大阪出版書籍目録, p. 217. Seibundō Shuppan, 1964.

27 Copied by Nagahira Motoori in November 2, 1838, owned by Keiō University. Text verification is done using a copy by Toyokai.

color, its call similar to a child's *Chūi yū* 吹竽, a type of flute²⁸.” The reason for calling Emperor's robe *Kōrozen* 黄櫨染 the “mountain pigeon color” is because of its color resembling the bird. The color of the robe is yellow on the back and blue front. It is dyed with *kariyasu* (かりやす *Miscanthus tinctorius*) and *murasaki* (紫 *Lithospermum erythrorhizon*), scum added. This is quoted in a secret book of clothes color, says another book [confirm this dyeing data with *Engishiki* 延喜式 and others].

Umashi took up residency in Arai from second November of 1813 to May of 1817, from his appointment to *Shita aratame* of Arai Gate 新居関下改, a gate regulator, until his appointment as professor at his *han* school. Since the layout paper seems to be submitted by November of 1815, this breakthrough must have taken place somewhere between then and May of 1817. It was close to the period of publication of the spring section of *Shinshō*, making it no surprise that he was still interested in this problem. During this stay in Arai, he came across a bird called mountain pigeon in Arai dialect. This bird, crying just like it is described in classical *waka*, also matched the cry and form of *qīng jīāo* described in *Honzō Kōmoku* (本草綱目 *Běncǎo Gāngmù*). By stating it as authority of the name “mountain pigeon color,” the bird which Arai people call “mountain pigeon” is identified with the so-called “mountain pigeon.” It is not stated, but Umashi probably came to confirm Keichū's claim of mountain pigeon being *Yobukodori*.

In the sentence after the previous quotation, Umashi closes the debate denying the *waka* that Irie Masaki introduced, pointing out that there is a different reading in the key expression “*oi no masaru ni* 老ひのまさるに” in the same *waka* found in the different section of same anthology. Here, Umashi finally confirms that the identity of the *Yobukodori* is that of the “mountain pigeon” by finding a folklore material which is certified by written evidence²⁹. Again, folklore method is used to both support and open up new avenues of inquiry.

I would now like to take a closer look at the way of writing to find out the foothold of his explicit faith in using folklore approach. The target is the part about Arai, leading to breakthrough. The first half describes his encounter with the mountain pigeon. By writing in chronological order, the readers can easily share the experience. What then, did Umashi wish to share?

In the note of his experience, his thoughts “simply wondering what it was,” “made me attracted all the more,” and “hoping to see its figure somehow” are carefully woven into the episode. All is about the cry of the bird, and all is pertinent to his argument. Of the three thoughts, the second is most important.

Umashi, curious about the bird's cry, finds out that it is the bird equivalent to

28 *Yū* is a flute similar to *Shō* 笙 but bigger, with sound 1 octave lower (*Nihon Ongaku Daijiten* 日本音楽大事典, ed. Hirano Kenji 平野健次 et al, p. 342. Heibonsha, 1989).

29 This conclusion is difficult to accept in modern scholarship, for Umashi treats all *waka*, from Heian to Kamakura, with equal value. There is a possibility of poets composing outside of rules after the confusion occurred.

Yobukodori. Then he found himself uttering a *Kokinshū* 古今集 *waka*³⁰: “をちこちのたつきもしらぬ山なかにおぼつかなくもよぶことりかな *Ochikochi no tatsuki mo shiranu yamanaka ni obotsukanaku mo yobukodori kana.*” (Spring 1, *waka* 29). This *waka*, which the mystery of *Yobukodori* originated in, not only matches the scenery in front of him, but the condition of Umashi “wondering what it was” matches the phrase “*obotsukanaku* おぼつかなく,” meaning uncertain. Umashi’s emotions are united with the *Kokinshū* poet.

The “unexpected” nature of this reaction caused him to be “all the more” interested in the bird. His exclamations of excitement indicate Umashi’s focus on the bird. It was not on success in capturing the identity, but in becoming one with the ancient people as a result of capture of identity. It should not be much of an oversimplification then, to assume Umashi’s faith in validity of the folklore method to be stemming from incidents like this where folklore led to a breakthrough in his own work.

Presenting folklore material such as dialect and provincial custom is the act of citing a familiar, contemporary phenomenon. By certifying an object of one’s day to the one of the ancient, a path is set to relieve the ancient mind. Such method should be significantly effective than listing of ancient writings or descriptive explanations.

The fact that Umashi favored such approach can be seen from his praise for Norinaga’s slang translation theory in *Shinshō* (explanatory note)³¹. This theory in *Kokinshū Tōkagami* 古今集遠鏡³² was explained using an analogy of food tasting:

*for beginners, a commentary is like listening to someone explaining the taste as sweet or hot. No matter how specific it may be, it is still difficult to grasp the details such as nuance and the function of grammar, like it is impossible to grasp them as one would with his own mind. On the other hand, translation in slang is like thinking with one’s own mind, just like tasting and knowing for themselves. This enables ancient noble words to be processed in their body. It often enables the best understanding of details of the whole *waka*.
(Preface)

Norinaga states that a commentary is similar to having someone explaining a taste, whereas slang translation “mostly in language near Kyoto” “in its informal speech” is similar to that of actual tasting for one’s self, something done firsthand. Since the dialect Norinaga uses as a “slang” is the one “near Kyoto”, it is not a dialect in a proper sense, but it surely was a language familiar to majority of readers at the time. Using slang, the gap between the ancient past and present is bridged, the world-view of *waka* becoming accessible to everyone. The reason for Umashi’s belief in the folklore world was not only because the material was appraised by Norinaga but because its success encourages one to acquire the eye of ancient people firsthand.

30 Citation is from *Shinpen Kokka Taikan CD-ROM version 2* (Kadokawa Shoten, 2003).

31 In the first entry, it says: “Nothing excels the explanation method in *Kokinshū Tōkagami* of Master Suzunoya.” In *Shinshō*, translation is avoided in fear of ruining the *waka* world, but it is attempted in print *Gosenshū* book, proving it the approach he yearned.

32 Citation is from vol. 770 and 772 of *Toyō Bunko* 東洋文庫 (Heibon Sha, 2008).

Conclusion

The approach taken by Nakayama Umashi in his *Gosenshū* research was mainly a traditional, philological one, supplemented by a method which could be called as “folklore.” The examples displayed in this paper show that Umashi, with his thorough scholarship, carefully proceeded with his speculation, and benefitted from his participation in the Motoori school.

It was not only in individual annotation that Umashi made effective use of the accumulated knowledge. The folklore method, Umashi’s academic specialty, probably also derived from Norinaga’s interest in folklore material and its continuing use within the school. The underlying belief perhaps came from the wish for the kind of experience recorded in the pursuit of the identity of *Yobukodori*. That is to say, believing that identifying the ancient to the existent half allows one to relive the *waka* world, leading to a more immediate learning of ancient sensibility sought in his school. Norinaga’s slang translation was directed the same way.

Such conclusion in turn shows the feature encapsulated within *Gosenshū*. The fact that the application of folklore material yields results, illustrates that *Gosenshū* contains the world of something marginal, things sometimes unsuitable for recording and is associated with countryside, while taking root in aristocratic life. The difference of approach taken by Ishihara Masaaki is also suggestive. This sender of “Provincial Custom Questionnaire” and the author of *Nennen Zuhihitsu* 年々隨筆, which contains abundant folklore information, rarely presents folklore evidence in his commentary, *Shinkokin Owari no Iezuto* 新古今尾張家苞³³. It is no surprise, for *Shinkokin Wakashū* 新古今和歌集 scarcely show closeness to scenes of marginal world of aristocracy, overall.

*I would like to extend my gratitude to the C. V. Starr East Asian Library of University of California, Berkeley, for accepting my research and allowing the use of rare books. I am also grateful to the gCOE project of Graduate School of Letters, Nagoya University, for supporting my research through the study abroad program.

33 He uses dialects in partial slang translation but not in arguments. Usage of custom is not seen. Reference to contemporary language as a whole is barely seen in *waka* 633 and 1546.